

## **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed July 3, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **I. Abstract Objections**

The abstract has been objected to for containing legal terminology. In response to the objection, Applicant has amended the abstract to remove such terminology. In view of that amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the abstract is not objectionable, and therefore respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

### **II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 15-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter.

In response, Applicant has amended remaining claims 15-20 to recite a “computer-readable medium”. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-20 are now directed to statutory subject matter as defined by 35 U.S.C. § 101 (e.g., a “manufacture”) and therefore respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

### **III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kemp, et al.* (“Kemp,” U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0078160).

As indicated above, each remaining independent claim has been amended through this Response. In view of the amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding the merits of claims 1 and 3-6, Applicant notes that Kemp at least does not teach “creating a press ready file at the designer location that encompasses both said print job and said job ticket”, “a preflight module at the print service provider location automatically opening said press ready file and automatically interpreting said job ticket, said preflight module further automatically verifying, relative to said job ticket, that said print job will be produced at said print service provider location as intended at the designer location”, or “said preflight module automatically correcting said press ready file to ensure processing substantially as intended”.

Turning to claims 7-12 and 15-20, Applicant notes that Kemp at least does not teach “an automated preflight module at the designer location automatically establishing a link to the print service provider location and obtaining updated device configuration information from the print service provider location concerning the specified finishing device”, “said preflight module automatically confirming that the specified finishing device can perform the finishing according to said finishing instructions of said job ticket”, “creating a production ready file at the designer location that encapsulates said print job and said job ticket”, or “generating a printed output of

said print job and finishing said printed output with the specified finishing device at the print service provider location in accordance with said finishing instructions from said job ticket”.

#### **IV. Provisional Double Patenting Rejections**

Claims 1-6 have been provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable in view of claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/635,452 (“the ‘452 patent”).

Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s preliminary identification of a possible double-patenting issue. Given that the claims of both patent applications may change during their respective prosecutions, Applicant opts to take no action relative to the provisional double patenting rejections at this time. If and when one or both of the patent applications is/are indicated as being in condition for allowance, Applicant will address the double-patenting rejections, if they are still outstanding.

#### **V. Canceled Claims**

Claims 2, 13, 14, and 21-23 have been canceled from the application without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to present these canceled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequently.


## **VI. New Claims**

Claims 24-26 have been added into the application through this Response. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims describe an invention novel and unobvious in view of the prior art of record and, therefore, respectfully requests that these claims be held to be allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David R. Risley  
Registration No. 39,345